

Message

From: Perovich, Gina [/O=EXCHANGELABS/OU=EXCHANGE ADMINISTRATIVE GROUP (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=6E3C19D7F4DB41BFA2477AA27AD83945-PEROVICH, GINA]
Sent: 5/19/2016 6:26:29 PM
To: Vandenberg, John [/o=ExchangeLabs/ou=Exchange Administrative Group (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/cn=Recipients/cn=dcae2b98a04540fb8d099f9d4dead690-Vandenberg, John]; D'Amico, Louis [/o=ExchangeLabs/ou=Exchange Administrative Group (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/cn=Recipients/cn=78a91f83c4414910be286efe02004dbc-D'Amico, Louis J.]; Jones, Samantha [/o=ExchangeLabs/ou=Exchange Administrative Group (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/cn=Recipients/cn=eac77fe3b20c4667b8c534c90c15a830-Jones, Samantha]; Ross, Mary [/o=ExchangeLabs/ou=Exchange Administrative Group (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/cn=Recipients/cn=98359cd1f66f46ec91d327e99a3c6909-Ross, Mary]
CC: Cogliano, Vincent [/o=ExchangeLabs/ou=Exchange Administrative Group (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/cn=Recipients/cn=51f2736376ac4d32bad2fe7cfef2886b-Cogliano, Vincent]
Subject: RE: IRIS, RDX and protection from cancer causing chemicals

Thanks for sharing (I think).
Adding Vince.

Gina Perovich
Deputy Director
IRIS Program
USEPA/ORD/NCEA
703-347-8656

From: Vandenberg, John
Sent: Thursday, May 19, 2016 1:42 PM
To: D'Amico, Louis <DAmico.Louis@epa.gov>; Jones, Samantha <Jones.Samantha@epa.gov>; Ross, Mary <Ross.Mary@epa.gov>; Perovich, Gina <Perovich.Gina@epa.gov>
Subject: FW: IRIS, RDX and protection from cancer causing chemicals

FYI -

From: Kathy Burns [<mailto:kmb@sciencecorps.org>]
Sent: Thursday, May 19, 2016 11:07 AM
To: Olden, Kenneth <Olden.Kenneth@epa.gov>; Vandenberg, John <Vandenberg.John@epa.gov>; Bussard, David <Bussard.David@epa.gov>; Kavlock, Robert <Kavlock.Robert@epa.gov>; Burke, Thomas <Burke.Thomas@epa.gov>
Subject: IRIS, RDX and protection from cancer causing chemicals

This went out to environmental, public health, occupational health and Veterans listserves today. Many of us are very disappointed with what is being done within the IRIS program .

Dr. Kathleen Burns
Director
Sciencecorps
Lexington, MA, USA
www.sciencecorps.org

May 19, 2016

Unless you deal with communities on or around military bases, you've likely not heard of RDX, a pervasive toxic chemical contaminant in those areas. You probably do know that the IRIS program at EPA has employed, up to this point, policies that rely on scientific evidence to make decisions on carcinogens. However, IRIS pushed out a draft RDX evaluation at last week's public meeting and claimed scientific consensus with the stakeholders – the Dept. of Defense, with ACC in attendance.

The IRIS program management ignored pro-public health comments from a retired NIEHS cancer expert, Dr. Ron Melnick, who argued that this is a likely human carcinogen and that IRIS conducted a faulty evaluation, downplaying it's cancer evidence.

Link to brief RDX intro & comments: http://www.sciencecorps.org/RDX_Evaluation_by_US_EPA.html

Link to comments: http://www.sciencecorps.org/RDX_R_Melnick_comments_to_EPA_docket.pdf

The IRIS assessment enables EPA to minimize cleanup requirements and establish far weaker water standards. It makes it easier for DOD to deny Veterans' RDX cancer claims and avoid cleanup costs.

Even more troubling, this IRIS evaluation has the potential to undermine future cancer assessments. It violates EPA's own cancer guidelines. If you don't have time to read Ron's comments or my cover note, you might want to look at the following text from the end of his comments:

"In its role of protecting people from toxic agents in the environment, it is EPA's obligation to promote policies that reduce human exposures to adverse environmental agents. The faulty cancer evaluation of RDX will result in risk management decisions that protect polluters rather than protecting US citizens who are exposed to this cancer--- causing chemical.the inappropriate application of the cancer descriptor differs markedly from evaluations of animal cancer data performed by the NTP, by the International Agency for Research on Cancer, and previously by EPA; and most importantly, it sets a bad precedent for future assessments of environmental carcinogens."

IRIS is the target of aggressive House Republican efforts to discredit it, partly due to its lack of output over many years. Pressure to "produce" isn't an excuse for skewed science that undermines public health. Many within the Agency and public health community believe that the evaluations might be better conducted in EPA Offices where management gives the highest priority to accurate science and public health protections. Bureaucratic survival is never an excuse for public harm.